MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
26 January 1967
INDEX

	Page
SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS	
1. Smithsonian Institution	
Calder Fountain, Museum of History & Technology	1
2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Svc	
a. National Zoological Park	2
b. Labor Department Building	2
c. F.B.I. Building	2
3. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency	
Overlook Parking Garage, Tenth Street Mall	3
4. Department of the Interior, National Park Service	
a. Fairfax Village Playground-Preliminary Plan	3
b. Dupont Circle Study	4
5. District of Columbia Government	
a. Department of Highways and Traffic	
Three Sisters Bridge	4
b. Department of Licenses and Inspections	
(1) Watergate Development-Revised Designs	4-5
(2) AIA Headquarters Building-Proposed Design	5-6
6. Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission	
Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial - Proposed Design	6

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

The second session of the regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in the office of the Interior Department Building on 26 January 1967, at 9:30 a.m., with Chairman William Walton presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Theodore Roszak
Aline Saarinen
Hideo Sasaki

Staff: C.H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald Myer, Asst. Secretary
Nancee Black, Research Asst.
Myra Younker, Editor
NCPC: Pat Astore
Recorder: Leone Vialpando

II. SUBMISSIONS-INTERVIEWS

1. Smithsonian Institution

Calder Fountain, Museum of History and Technology

Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Dr. David Scott, Director, National Collection of Fine Arts, Mr. Walter Cain, architect of the open court for the fountain, and Mrs. Morris Cafritz, donor of the Calder sculpture, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Dr. Ripley explained that the sculpture, a metal stabile some 40' high, would have jets of water about it part of the time while at other times the pool would be dry and be used for activities of the museum.

The members suggested that the walk extend around all four sides of the pool and that the retaining wall on the south side be made as inconspicuous as possible by landscaping and retention of a natural slope. The Commission's approval of these preliminary plans was forwarded to the Smithsonian Institution. EXHIBIT A

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Mr. Karel Yasko, Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Mr. Hunter, representatives of Public Buildings Service attended the meeting during the discussion of the following projects.

a. National Zoological Park - Proposed Design

Dr. Theodore H. Reed of the Zoological Park, Mr. Alan Jacobs and Mr. William Metcalf, architects, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Jacobs gave a detailed explanation of the development of the master plan. Mr. Sasaki expressed the Commission's approval, in general, of the master plan which showed a considerable improvement over previous studies. The entrances were clearly defined, parking facilities were well located along the hillside away from public view, and the display areas, both outdoor and building were well organized and resulted in a fairly strong composition. While the plan revealed strength, the small scale sketches indicating character showed a tendency toward the kind of mannerisms too often associated with Zoo designs, and the architects were urged to show some restraint in developing more detailed designs for the buildings. The Master Plan was generally approved with reservations on the approaches from Harvard Street. The plans for the multi-climate area were approved for location and siting only, with no action taken on the style or character indicated in the sketches. EXHIBIT B

b. Labor Department Building - Revised Design.

Mr. Pitts of Pitts, Mebane, Phelps and White, architects, represented both architectural firms, during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Bunshaft, speaking for the Commission, stated that the design was approved provided the north elevation of the second floor continue the same window pattern shown in the other elevations. The architects had introduced a different spacing over the tunnel portals, and for some reason, where the library occured.

The Commission's approval, with provisions, was forwarded to General Services Administration. EXHIBIT C

c. F.B.I. Building - Revised Designs

Representatives of C.F. Murphy and Associates, and Beiswenger, Hoch, Arnold and Associates, architects, attended the meeting during the discussion of this design.

Mr. Bunshaft stated that the members considered the revised plan for the courtyard acceptable and approved the design.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to General Services Administration. EXHIBIT D

3. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

Overlook Parking Garage, Tenth Street Mall - Proposed Design

Mr. Thomas Appleby, Director of RLA and Mr. Dan Kiley, landscape architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Sasaki stated that the scheme was greatly improved, was an excellent solution to the pedestrian circulation problem and provided a clearly defined terminus to the 10th Street Mall. The plan read strongly as an overlook and was well integrated with the site, the remainder of which was landscaped as a park.

The members discussed the vertical openings for ventilation and lighting, pointing out that it would be a more appropriate expression for an office building. They recommended fewer openings and proportioned to relate to the horizontality of the parking decks. The architect preferred having no light on the plaza, but to provide illumination by lighting only the pool itself. This feature and the ventilation problem will be studied further.

Mr. Appleby stated that the garage would be privately financed and operated while the overlook plaza will be constructed with public funds and maintained by the National Park Service.

The Commission approved the concept of the design and will review further studies as they are developed.

The Commission's action was forwarded to the Redevelopment Land Agency. EXHIBIT E

4. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

a. Fairfax Village Playground - Preliminary Plan

Officials of the Park Service and Mr. Hartman, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Hartman stated that the building fits into the hillside in such a way that little terracing or changes in elevation would be required. The roof would be dark sheet metal, preferably copper, and the walls ribbed concrete. Baffles would protect the skylights in the roof and serve as a protective screen. The tower feature permits natural lighting of the stage. The majority of glass was kept from the elevations to meet the requirements of wall space and to minimize destruction and vandalism.

The members commended the architect on his imaginative design, and careful handling of a difficult site.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to the National Park Service. EXHIBIT F

b. Dupont Circle Study

Mr. Walter Roth, representing the National Park Service, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Roth explained that the study was to increase the paved area around the fountain, eliminate the low metal fence, enlarge the sloped bank which exists between the two levels, diminishing slightly the width of the outer circle. A low clipped hedge such as pyrocanthus would be the only planting around the fountain.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Sasaki suggested that the hedge be eliminated and steps continued around the entire base of the pool. This would make the area more usable, easier to maintain, and provide more seating space. The Commission stressed the need to accommodate the public in one of the few parks of such intensive usage.

The Commission's views were forwarded to the National Park Service.
EXHIBIT G

5. District of Columbia Government

a. Department of Highways and Traffic

Three Sisters Bridge (Central Potomac River Crossing) - Proposed Design.

Mr. G. I. Sawyer and other officials of the Department of Highways and Traffic, Mr. Lorimer and Mr. Fox, representatives of the engineering firm attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Bunshaft expressed the Commission's view that the single span bridge was esthetically the best design provided the same arch construction is continued into the embankment at both ends, thus reinforcing the continuity of highway and bridge.

The Commission's advice was accepted as feasible but considerably more expensive. A study of the total bridge, from embankment to embankment, having a continuous arch will be made. A model and drawings of this study will be submitted when developed.

The Commission's advice was forwarded to the Department of Highways and Traffic.
EXHIBIT G[a]

b. Department of Licenses and Inspections

(1) Watergate Development - Revised Designs

Messrs. Graff, Valmarana and Salgo, representing the

architects attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Bunshaft expressed the Commission's disapproval of the architects' proposal. He stressed that the design of the first apartment building should be repeated in this apartment -- the pattern and number of balconies should be the same rather than increased. There should be no change of expression in the middle band and the top floor should repeat the design of the top floor of the first building. The Commission would not approve any revision of the original design.

The architects' explanation of their changes did not convince the members that the original design required revising.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

(2) A.I.A. Headquarters Building - Proposed Design

Mr. Willis Mills, Chairman of the A.I.A. Headquarters Committee, Mr. Scheick, Executive Director of the A.I.A. and Messrs. Mitchell and Giurgola, architects attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

According to Mr. Mills, the plan was to provide space for the A.I.A. activities and space for future growth which would be rental space until needed by the A.I.A. He stated that the A.I.A. Board and Committee felt that the approach was valid -- beginning with preservation of the Octagon House, continuing with the garden, and developing a building at the rear of the property. Purchase of the Lemon Building property greatly eased the crowding of the Octagon, one of the earlier concerns of the Commission.

Mr. Giurgola explained certain features of the plan, including exhibit areas on the same level as the garden, conference and board rooms on an upper level with a lounge or balcony overlooking the exhibit area. A small auditorium was beneath the conference room. Office space would be on the upper floors, and to the rear of the property. Parking and work rooms would be in the basement. In answer to the members' questions, he stated that the Octagon House would serve as an architectural history museum and for social activities of the A.I.A. The plan would provide approximately 100,000 square feet net office space. The proposed design was sympathetic to the scale and character of the Octagon House, the architects contended.

Chairman Walton stated that the Commission would take the project under advisement.

Before the close of the meeting and in executive session, the Commission continued its discussion of the design. The majority of members

felt the design was more or less a collection of current cliches and forms. A better solution would be to leave the site as it is and alter the Lemon Building. They agreed that the problem should be studied more thoroughly and after further deliberation decided that the designs were still too schematic to give any detailed critique. The Commission's views were forwarded to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

6. Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission

Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial - Proposed Design.

Marcel Breuer and Herbert Beckhard, architects, Congressman Frank Thompson, Jr., the Honorable Francis Biddle, and James H. Rowe, Jr., members of the Roosevelt Memorial Commission, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Breuer discussed the design's relationship to the site stating that it complemented rather than competed with the Lincoln Memorial and Washington Monument. Mr. Breuer's explanation of the design is contained in the transcript attached as EXHIBIT H.

Chairman Walton expressed the Commission's appreciation to Mr. Breuer for the detailed description of the concept and design and to the members of the Memorial Commission for attending the meeting. He stated that the Commission of Fine Arts would take the project under advisement.

In executive session immediately following the presentation the members discussed their opinions of the design based on Mr. Breuer's interpretation of his concept. Much of the deliberation revolved around the same points discussed the previous day. When the vote was taken, it was unanimous for disapproval of the design. Mr. Warnecke and Mr. Kelly were not present for the vote. Mr. Kelly later asked that the minutes show he would have approved the design had he been present. Transcript of the discussion is EXHIBIT I.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Roosevelt Memorial Commission. EXHIBIT J. A press release of the Commission's action was released the following day. EXHIBIT K.

The meeting adjourned at 2:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

2 March 1967

Dear Dr. Ripley:

This will confirm the Commission's approval of the Calder Fountain scheme presented at our January 25th meeting.

As you know, the only note of caution we sounded was in the handling of the grade changes. Specifically the design of the retaining wall south of the pool and the slope from 14th Street are things the Commission would like to see again as further details are developed.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Dr. S. Dillon Ripley
Secretary
The Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit A

28 February 1967

Dear Mr. Knott:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the most recent studies of the master plan and multi-climate facilities at the National Zoological Park on January 25th.

As far as the plans go they appear to be fine. However they are still largely schematic, especially in regard to the design of the actual buildings themselves. Therefore we could not approve anything in detail. We are encouraged, however, by the new plan which has a strong sense of unity and cohesiveness for the first time.

We would like to direct attention to one aspect of the site plan for more detailed study. The approach from Harvard Street up a rather steep and imposing ramp structure may be somewhat overstated. Perhaps something closely adjusted to the existing contours of the slope would be more appropriate.

Our next meeting is scheduled for April 18 and 19 and we would be glad to see further studies at that time.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit B

28 February 1967

Dear Mr. Knott:

Facade studies and site plan for the Labor Department Building presented at both our January and February meetings have been approved by the Commission. Progress continues to be very encouraging.

The only portion of the design which remains to be approved, according to our records, is the north elevation, especially those areas over the tunnel portals and the area on the second floor enclosing the library. We would also like to see samples of material.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit C

28 February 1967

Dear Mr. Knott:

This will confirm the Commission's approval of the courtyard designs for the Federal Bureau of Investigation which were presented at our meeting on January 25th. The revised scheme is much more satisfactory than the original.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit D

24 February 1967

Dear Mr. Appleby:

This will confirm the Commission's approval of the Tenth Street Overlook Parking Facility presented at our January 26th meeting.

As you will recall, the approval was conditioned on some additional study of the openings on the curved walls facing toward the south. They looked a little too much like an office building. Perhaps a wider spacing would be more appropriate. We would also like to take a look at the materials which, of course, should tie in with the rest of the masonry on the Tenth Street Mall.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. L. Thomas Appleby
Executive Director
D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency
1420 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Exhibit E

28 February 1967

Dear Mr. Jett:

This will confirm the Commission's approval of the Fairfax Village Playground which was presented at our January 25th meeting.

The Commission found the design of this facility to be imaginative and particularly skillful on a difficult site. The appearance of the city and the utility park system will be greatly enhanced if this particular design can set a precedent and a standard for similar projects in the future.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. T. Sutton Jett
Regional Director
National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit F

28 February 1967

Dear Mr. Jett:

This will confirm the Commission's action on the Dupont Circle study that was presented at our meeting on January 25th.

The Commission sees little difference between the present proposal and existing conditions. It appears to be nothing more than a slight modification of the width of the walk and flower beds which now encircle the fountain. Experience over the last couple of years has proven this to be a basically poor solution. None of the planting materials has survived, despite the fence, and the conditions around the fountain are generally bad. We feel the only solution is to accept reality and recognize that the fountain has been and will continue to be a lively drawing point for large numbers of people, a fact which makes it unique among the many parks in the entire city.

As the Commission sees it, the best way to accommodate these crowds is to provide a series of granite steps that continuously encircle the base of the fountain. This will provide a simple and dignified setting and also will be easy to maintain and keep clean.

We do not agree that providing a large sitting area around the fountain will make it susceptible to vandalism. On the contrary, experience has proven that in parks where many people are present there is less likelihood of destruction. In any event, this is not an architectural problem but one of surveillance.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. T. Sutton Jett
Regional Director
National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit C

28 February 1967

Dear Mr. Airis:

This will confirm the Commission's action on the proposed designs for the Three Sisters Bridge that were considered at our January 25th meeting.

The single span of orthotropic construction is strongly favored by the Commission. The scheme provides a strong and simple statement of the river crossing, a problem which all too often in the recent past has not been solved when the bridge is part of a major highway network. This solution also affords much greater freedom in the recreational uses of the river which is an important consideration at this location.

Some comments were made to the architects about the design of the two abutments on either end. Since the structure essentially acts as a beam, the abutments should be designed accordingly, that is, not appearing to take the thrust of a shallow arch, as was indicated in the material presented.

The next meeting of the Commission is scheduled for 18 and 19 April and we would be happy to see any new material at that time.

By Direction of the Chairman:

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Thomas F. Airis
Director
Department of Highways and Traffic
District Building
Washington, D.C. 20004

Exhibit C-2

represents the attitude, I would say, of the board and the committee, and that is they are very happy with the aspect of the approach of this design, which finds its genesis in the Octagon and the garden itself, rather than a superimposed form or attitude in the new building, so that we think it is a valid approach and a very honest one that promises to us great success to start with the Octagon and the garden and develop a building with that as its beginning point.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Thank you.

If there are no more questions from the Commission, we'll thank you very much and take it under advisement.

II.6. Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we are very happy to welcome this distinguished group, and though you have retired, Mr. Biddle, I understand you are still in command of the troops.

MR. BIDDLE: No, I retired only as chairman; I'm still a member, and may I say a word?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We'd like very much for you to do so.

MR. BIDDLE: I just want to say I am sorry there are not more members of the Commission here. Another member, Frank Thompson, will be coming up shortly. We are shy Senator Saltonstall; Senator Neuberger; Congressman Keogh, the chairman. They are all off now and Senator McCarthy is

Exhibit H

very sick at home, so we thought we'd not try to meet to elect a chairman and you would let us present it without any chief. That's the situation.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Oh, certainly. It will center around the designer, I presume, Mr. Breuer.

Congressman Halpern, do you want to say anything before you go?

MR. HALPERN: No. As I mentioned, I do have an appointment in the vicinity that is quite important. I won't be very long. It is my intention to get back as quickly as I can, so I hope you will excuse me.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: In that case, then, we would like Mr. Breuer to come forward and explain, educate us.

MR. BREUER: We have sent you a description. I don't know whether you received that -- the ideas of the memorial.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have received everything, and we spent a great deal of time --

MR. BREUER: Would you like me just to start at the beginning or would you like me to answer your questions?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, no. We'd rather you went from your beginning.

MR. BREUER: All right. Well, the FDR memorial, as you know, myself and my office were commissioned in the early summer of last year. At that time we worked on the basis

of the previous competition, the competition which had first prize, as you know, and had a kind of story and it was desired that the memorial be executed.

The memorial can be considered, I think, from two points of view: the one is the purely architectural or the landscape planning, what is the architectural formal expression; and the second one is how it represents Roosevelt.

It was these two points that I tried to solve in my own way. If we consider the architecture first, the memorial, as you know, should be placed somewhere in this peninsula and it was left to the designers in the competition as to where we wanted to place it.

We came to the conclusion that we would place it in this spot for two reasons (indicating): the peninsula here is the narrowest -- the water is the closest to the memorial, and ~~Also because~~ in this spot were very few existing trees which have to be removed. You have a beautiful view of the opposite shore of the Washington Memorial. ~~Also because~~ This seems to us an approach that is somewhat closer.

Now, halfway through this work we learned about a general plan of Washington. We didn't know that before. This general plan -- maybe you know more about it than I do, which Owings was working on?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. the mall plan.

MR. BREUER: The mall plan, with the Secretary of the Interior, and this plan was for us somewhat in contradiction

with the conditions, so we got in touch directly with Secretary Udall and also with Owings, and we considered this plan now in this project, rather than the original plan which was required by the competition.

For instance, just to illustrate that, the competition plan has still assumed a bridge and specified all approaches. All connections to Independence Avenue had to be maintained by the plan, by the project. Now Independence and Seventh Street in the Owings plan or the Udall plan, whatever you call it, is completely eliminated and the bridge is taken off and this whole traffic comes through underground, and apparently this project is probable and very close to execution. Consequently, we felt it's much better to consider that. Probably the most important consequence of this project to us is that in the competition, they asked for parking facilities for about 300 or 350 cars. This eliminates all cars from the mall areas. The idea is not to have any cars parked except on the River Road here (indicating), a kind of through traffic if you want to call it that. No other vehicular traffic. Outside in Washington at various points will be large parking arrangements and from there on, people will visit the parks and the monuments by minibus. This route which we provided here is a minibus route, approximately -- not exactly -- approximately on the

on the lines of the vehicular plan. We attached this to this plan which is now still in work, rather than the original conditions of the competition.

As far as the form is concerned, we tried to do a horizontal monument and not a vertical one. If I may say, I thought that the original project which won first prize in the competition was, in my feeling, quite an interesting project and only two points I had criticized later on, on it. I don't know whether you would agree with that. One was the verticality of the project which somewhat competes with the Washington Monument and also the Lincoln Memorial which is sitting on a high platform. The other was that it was in concrete. With all my love for the material, concrete does not suggest, if I may use a banal word, eternity, what a memorial should suggest. I think, if it is a pure memorial, and I think this was the Commission's decision before. Personally I very much agree, that the material should not be utilitarian, but something which is also a memorial. It should be a pure memorial, a pure sculptural architecture or landscape or whatever form it takes, and a pure expression of the memorial idea.

We thought, being attached to some kind of utilitarian idea, that would attach this idea to the idea of recreation, nature, parks, leisure, things of that type, which I think it is probably very good to combine a

memorial idea, like the Greek ruins or Mexican ruins, ~~somewhat~~ with the combined idea of leisurely walking between these parts, trees, sky, landscape, and at the same time it is a memorial.

We tried to make a horizontal arrangement and tried to find a form whereby the memorial is practically part of the grounds, grows out of the ground or let's say disappears in to the ground. The height of the memorial, absolute height from the water level, is just a few feet more than half of the Lincoln Memorial. The Lincoln Memorial is about double the height from the water level, ~~and~~ of course the water level is so dominant here, ~~everywhere,~~ looking at it from every point, I think it is very legitimate.

MRS. SAARINEN: May I interrupt to ask you what that is, there's nothing on the scale.

MR. BREUER: True height is 60.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It was 69.

MR. BREUER: It's 60 feet from here to the ground up to the highest point. From the water it's 73, I think. Lincoln Memorial is something like 141, I think.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That's right.

MR. BREUER: Washington Monument of course is much higher. We felt more memorials would come into this area later on and it should not be a kind of race between the memorials, which are higher and which one is seen ~~one sees~~ better.

We tried to feel in this memorial something

practically part of the land, something that flows from the land and disappears in the land.

Further on, I think in Washington, probably a very important element of Washington is the axial composition of Washington, the great axis between Lincoln, Washington, and the Capitol; and the secondary axis between Jefferson and the White House. We tried to fit into this axis without limiting ourselves too much by this axial arrangement.

So this approach to the memorial (indicating on drawing) from this bus station is at right angles with the Lincoln-Capitol axis and parallel with Jefferson-White House axis, and the elements of the memorial also are coordinated with this direction.

That is how we hope that this thing, from the air, especially, fits into the Washington landscape.

Now, this has been so far connections with Washington generally. The connection about the identification of Roosevelt in this memorial is partly symbolic, partly very direct, probably more direct than any other memorial would do. I know that's been very much discussed. All the designers were engaged with the same problem. It's a great problem in a modern, present-day memorial, the portrait of the man whom you want to present -- the sculpture, the direct connection. And the first phase of the previous project was without such direct connection, and the second one ha

on the request of the Commission, a figure of Roosevelt more or less in the center of the memorial; and We felt that probably this classic statue or idealized presentation is probably not according to Roosevelt's own spirit. He was a man of change, of responding to the times, to the demands of the age, the period, our period, our time, and It seems to me that this sculptural idealizing statue is something of an anachronism, not only from my own point of view but from the point of view of Roosevelt. So we have been looking for another identification, and realizing of course that the symbolic ideas in this composition which we have, ~~we have such symbolic ideas, but they~~ have to be explained, have to be understood by people. We probably need more direct reference to the ideas or to the personality of Roosevelt.

The one direct reference is -- and I must say that out of personal experience, I came about 1937 to this country and was very much impressed by the radio speeches of Roosevelt. I think that was probably a great part of his strength, his voice and his speeches, how they were formulated, how they were presented. I think it was a great carrier of his ideas, a great help to him, his voice; and Today technology, modern possibilities, make it absolutely possible to hear somebody's voice who has been dead ten years or a hundred years.

Consequently, we propose that from a speaker from

one point, quotations from Roosevelt's speeches are reproduced, and I would like to emphasize there that we are very conscious about it, that it isn't more disagreeable than forcefully being exposed to hearing noise effects, if I may say that with that tough word. So we thought these quotations should probably be short quotations from his speeches. They would probably be one, two, three minutes each -- a maximum of three minutes, between five to eight-minute intervals, his normal speaking voice, not broadcast all over this memorial but a normal speaking voice. Groups of about 30 or 40 people, 40 being the maximum, would stand listening while other people are walking around in a leisurely fashion under the shade of the trees.

This was the one idea to identify him. The second is that we reproduce in one phase of this center cube an actual photographic portrait of Roosevelt, and for that we had to go out and borrow the technique or adopt the technique of the printers' half-tone technique of printing blocks, which you see here in this one (indicating), and on that one in a smaller scale, and We have a sample of the granite there. The idea is from this half-tone block, these points you see are what a half-tone block really looks like in the enlargement; and these points I'd like to transfer to the granite in a three-dimensional way. That way we have a kind of photographic reproduction, but in granite, something which lasts forever. We developed this technique ourselves with the help

of half-tone engravings. Also the granite-cutters' industry helped us on that They made many, many experiments. This one you see here is one of them -- that small one.

As far as the scale is concerned, this would be about half the scale ~~than~~ of the actual portrait ~~would be~~ on ~~this~~ granite. This granite is 36 feet in every ~~direction~~ ~~in~~ dimension. Consequently, if we reproduce Roosevelt, let's say, sitting or from the hands and face, there are such photographs available, ~~Then~~ it would be about double the scale, double every one of those points. -- They'd be twice as big as they are there. -- ~~so~~ you have to go back probably ~~so~~ as far as I am from the wall, 20 or 25 feet, ~~and~~ then you see this picture which is then a kind of real document of what Roosevelt looked like and how his voice sounded.

In that way we thought a direct representation of his personality is satisfied.

There are also symbolic ideas in this composition. It's like a turbine with the center turning force, turning something which projects. If you have a centrifugal body moving around, and some part of this body separates from the body, the centrifugal force throws it off in the direction of the tangents and these are all tangents to this turning center, if I may say so. Of course, this is symbolically understood and is somewhat characteristic of the Roosevelt era -- his friends, his associates, and his group who produced ideas and launched them into the great masses, ~~into~~ the people.

We know that some of these ideas gained general acceptance and are today still alive and have even increased and matured. This is somewhat symbolized by these tangential granite walls which kind of disappear into the ground, into the nature or basic things.

In the center is this 36-foot granite block. It is kind of floating, not resting on the ground, from the center cantilever granite construction, and it is floating free from the ground ~~which~~ -- We would hope that this will suggest the strength and the solidity and the standing power of Roosevelt, ~~and~~ by being free from the ground and By being polished dark granite, a gray granite, polished ~~which~~ it reflects the sky, the changing weather. Again I have to use very banal words -- there's some spiritual content or appearance to this large granite block, partly disappearing in the sky and changing with the weather, ~~and~~ It is kind of floating over the ground.

All these granite darts or slabs have water alongside -- this is a water strip here (indicating on model) Again this is for two reasons: one is to keep the place cool ~~because~~ I have found, in visiting memorials in Washington, that the sun is very hot and is a serious thing to cope with, ~~plus if you try~~ to provide water and trees for cooling and shade -- and of course these walls at different times of the

day will sometimes show shadows. And two: ~~but also~~ these small walls ~~here, they~~ prevent the people on this narrower part, which is still something like 16 or 18 feet I think, from stepping into the water. The wall protects them.

The inside of these walls carries lighting equipment which lights these walls ~~up~~. The strongest lighting is here (indicating on model), diminishing that way, so ~~always~~ one side of these walls will always ~~would~~ be lighted in the night. ~~Also~~ One side of this, the entrance side, will be lighted from the opposite side wall, above the eye level of the people, ~~so~~ They don't see this light, when ~~to have~~ the memorial is lighted up at night, ~~and also~~ from the air. The air view I think is an important factor today, especially here, where practically all the planes fly over the river, ~~as far as I know,~~ when they ~~in~~ approaching the airport, ~~fly over the river,~~ or take off ~~over the river,~~ ~~and also~~ From the top of the Washington Memorial, approximately some 500 feet, some two or three million people a year get a very good view. So the air view is very important and the air throughout this composition is turning, flows ~~them~~ away -- ideas, directions, thoughts -- People will be more visible.

We ~~also~~ wanted very much to connect this memorial with nature, with the ground, and that is why you see here the green areas grow into the memorial. It is really intercepted with park areas, ~~and~~ Here are benches where people can sit down in the shade or in the sun, whatever they

prefer.

I may probably add ~~this~~ these little blocks -- not that ~~it's~~ they are so little, -- I think something like 18 feet long, the scale is. These blocks prevent people from walking up, particularly children or some jokers, prangsters, and so on. They can't walk over the top of this polished granite, so we made a kind of sculptural element. You can look through it. It is a kind of hook which hooks up this end part of the slab.

As far as planting is concerned, I mentioned that here is this view to the Washington Memorial and across the water. There we have to remove one or two trees, very few -- probably three or four altogether, which are the original Japanese cherries planted along this coast. We'll keep them and move them. That is possible. And that way we have an open vista there, and we set up more benches there so people can sit down and enjoy this view. Otherwise, the new planting we thought should all be magnolias. The magnolias bloom first Then the cherries. And then there is a general project which really has nothing to do directly with our memorial, but we considered it. This is the National Rose Garden, and these roses would then be blooming after the cherries, again in the summer, so that we have somewhere in this part flowering trees or bushes up to late summer or early fall.

This main approach, -- the minibuses would stop in

this little square (indicating on drawing), where there are information booths. From there you walk to the memorial. There is a special planting of tall beeches or columnar beeches, which have the appearance of a poplar tree, but they're a much better tree, more durable, three or four hundred years of life. But it's a tall, narrow tree which defines this relation to the axis again, the Washington axis.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, that is a very fascinating explanation. May the Commission ask questions?

MR. BREUER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mrs. Saarinen.

MRS. SAARINEN: I don't really have any. It was a very lucid, clear presentation.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Bunshaft, any questions?

MR. BUNSHAFT: No.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Roszak?

MR. ROSZAK: I was wondering if the portrait of Roosevelt is going to appear on all four sides, and since the subtlety of the half-tone is so --

MRS. SAARINEN: He said one side.

MR. ROSZAK: One side. Then the next question is, the subtlety of the half-tone is really sensitive, and I was wondering how the image of Roosevelt will come off as a pictorial statement when those granite holes get fairly dark?

You see right now they're light.

MRS. SAARINEN: When the inner holes get dark.

MR. BREUER: Excuse me. I probably have not explained that sufficiently. I should have explained that. I apologize. This is polished and this is rough (indicating two samples). This is the black and white.

MR. ROSZAK: My point, Mr. Breuer, is that that granite will not stay the same value.

MR. BREUER: The polished granite does.

MR. ROSZAK: Not the polished -- the light color.

MR. BREUER: By dirt?

MR. ROSZAK: Yes.

MR. BREUER: Very little. We're doing quite an extensive examination of other buildings. Washington is probably the town with the least dirt in the air compared with --

MR. ROSZAK I was wondering how the subtlety of that half-tone will work, will hold up.

MR. BREUER: I don't believe it will change much, and of course it can always be cleaned off. But I really don't think so. Up to now we have worked without any means. These people have done that all for personal reasons. This was not made for all this experimentation which costs a lot of money, but should we go into execution of the work, we'll make larger studies, whole slabs, where we can really judge this effect. We are very conscious about it, that there is a

problem there. As far as I can see from the samples -- we made probably eight or ten different definite executions, and I have the feeling it will work.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Sasaki, do you have any questions?

MR. SASAKI: No, actually not. Let's see - Mr. Breuer, from what side do you visualize people entering principally? Of course here (indicating) but then the minibus goes through, and there would be a strong temptation to stop somewhere here. Can they get off?

MR. BREUER: They would come from here (indicating) or if they come from here (indicating), they'll stop here (indicating on drawing). I think this point is about the center point between the Lincoln Memorial and this memorial, and also to the Roosevelt. Now some people may come over the water, and we suggest here a new dock, because I think that would be a very nice thing, week ends and so on, if people could have a little relaxation here, coming by the water. Here is proposed -- again not strictly part of the memorial -- but proposed, a refreshment bar, or terrace with tables and so on for relaxation, to be created here. So I think most people come from this side (indicating) unless somebody walks over, for instance. You can walk anywhere of course to the memorial. But the main mass of visitors, whether they are natives or from

outside, I think would approach from here and from here (indicating).

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: I'm Frank Thompson from New Jersey, the Acting Secretary of the Commission. I thought your Commission might like to know that on December 20th, the Roosevelt Commission met in New York in Mr. Breuer's office and enjoyed such a presentation as you have now, following which, after lengthy discussion and questioning, the Commission, nine members of which were present, unanimously agreed to approve this design and to suggest its earliest possible implementation. Beyond that, we have no further report but I thought your record might show that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, we read about it.

Mr. Breuer, thank you so much for a very lucid explanation which is most educational and inspiring. The Commission has already studied and will continue to study the design, and we'll give it the very closest consideration within our power.

So we thank all of you for coming, Mr. Rowe included. It's a pleasure to have you.

- - -

MR. SASAKI: The photograph, as published, of that rendering there I thought was a little too massive and ponderous, and I had not seen that site plan. Now, after

seeing the site plan, I think it is a whole lot better than what I personally thought when I saw the photograph. After, you know, listening to Breuer's point of view, I think there is -- you know -- quite a lot of merit in this and my own feeling is I'm not so strongly against it as I was earlier. I think that the good qualities are that it is not so vertical. I think sculpturally the other one was perhaps more successful, but in relation to the site, I think Breuer is quite right. I objected to the vertical thing too, although I didn't vote. I thought it would be appropriate not at this point but sticking way out where Hains Point comes out. Now I think in terms of the site plan, with this coming this way (indicating), and this going down, I think there is quite a lot of sophistication. It's obvious Breuer is a good designer and after listening to his explanation, if I were to express an opinion, I would be almost on the borderline.

And then there are many things, because you read through the press, like the voice which just offended me, I didn't like it. I still think a memorial should be silent, not be eloquent.

Also here I did not like the photo etching, but then explaining it, it's in the way of a sculptural sort of thing so I don't find that as objectionable as I did originally. Certainly if it's only one side -- it's not as bad as if it were all the way around.

I think it is obviously a serious attempt by a good designer. I keep wondering if anyone else did it, it would get any better.

MRS. SAARINEN: That's just what I said to Gordon. It terrifies me. I came in yesterday and wrote a very violent personal statement because I didn't know I was coming back today, and I just said to Gordon I think I'm chicken a bit because I think -- I said the same as you did yesterday, too. I like that horizontality. However, I do think this is a very plagiaristic use of the other things. The other had form and had speeches on the slabs which was somehow a justification for the stelae. I thought the canned voice unforgivable and didn't like the pop art portrait.

I still think some of these things, but not like on a crusade. I keep wondering suppose we say no to this, who will we get who can do anything better, since they didn't accept your landscape plan?

I wouldn't say I totally switched over.

MR. SASAKI: I think there are certain aspects. We should cut the voice part out.

MRS. SAARINEN: Why couldn't the voice be in the information thing?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Gordon.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think what you're all talking about

is that Breuer is a very nice man. He's sick and made a very nice presentation. I think that has more influence than anything, and I think any human being would be influenced, but it's not going to influence me. I think it is a terrible design.

I don't know how one finds a place for it except as a great thing but this isn't the place. You're just fooling yourself with some little rose garden here that will be about four feet high.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. Ignore it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I happen to be a great admirer of Roosevelt -- I guess perhaps all of us are -- and I'd hate to see this thing built just because Breuer is a nice guy. I'd rather see nothing built. Really I think this is kind of serious -- this little water -- gee whiz! I don't know that I could do better, but that's not the problem. The problem is that here is a thing being submitted, and I think Roosevelt truly a great man, and I don't think this is much of anything. It might be better just to have a block some place. The nicest thing is Roosevelt's burial up at his house -- just grass, hedge, and a stone. That to me has been something rather great which he did, I understand.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: And every time I go back, it gets better.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It would be better if nothing

happened. I would hate to be a party to this. Seriously. I also hate to be a -- you know, Breuer is charming but he's not charming for nothing, my friend! He's a nice guy.

MR. ROSZAK: There are times when you have to be more than Hungarian.

MR. SASAKI: Your comment is very true. We should not let a person influence.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I was thinking when he was talking, what a tough blow that's going to be.

MR. SASAKI: Yes. I think the position I'm sitting in here seeing this as a sort of spatial thing is really quite good. I think to design any monument is a difficult thing because we're not in the period of monument building. If we did something that had been done traditionally, it would be a very simple thing, but we are seeking a new solution.

The reason I said I think he's a good designer, the more I look at it, he knows what he's doing.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, a lot went into it.

MR. SASAKI: There's a sense of space in here with centrality but the centrality is not like a statue.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Move over to my seat -- where you're walking down this mall.

MR. SASAKI: Then there is space that moves.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Seriously, come over here. This is the

main approach.

MRS. SAARINEN: The approach is the worst view.

MR. SASAKI: Yes, the approach is.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The worst view.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Do you like these forms, this triangular thing? I don't.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No.

Do you feel strongly enough, Hideo, that you want to cast a vote in favor of it?

MR. ROSZAK: These triangles are extremely excessive. You get involved in modernism.

MR. BUNSHAFT: A great building doesn't care what it is: round, flat, or anything; but there is no silhouette to that.

MR. SASAKI: Yes, but you see, again I think it does not matter what particular form of art, be it music, painting, or poetry, one's first impulse is to reject it if we're not familiar with it, and I think in that silhouette there, too, my feeling is, my objection to it is not that it doesn't have a strong form. It has an excessively strong form, and it's too --

MR. ROSZAK: overbearing.

MR. SASAKI: Yes. Ponderous like you find in the pyramids or something. I wish they were contemporary forms. I would have under cut this like that (indicating on model)

to express a lifting of this. Then the whole thing would look like the fan. I keep asking myself whether that is not building. After all, if I designed it, I'd do it one way, Breuer would do it another way. Who am I to say he's wrong and I'm right?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have only one design to consider here.

MR. SASAKI: Yes, right, so if Breuer says he likes it this way, I have no answer to it.

I wonder about these things (indicating on model)

MR. ROSZAK: Kids could go right over those. There's no problem there. One could scramble on another's shoulder and they're off.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This photograph -- granite, when it gets wet, gets dark.

MR. ROSZAK: You wouldn't see that portrait at all.

MR. BUNSHAFT: One of the strange things about granite, it absorbs water. That's the last detail that bothers me.

MR. ROSZAK: It was just a question of bringing up some interest.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We had to talk about something.

Well, where are we?

MRS. SAARINEN: Oh, dear! I wish I had stayed in

New York.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't see how we have any choice. I think you are talking about sentiment. This is a damn serious thing, building this for Roosevelt. And this thing would happen.

MRS. SAARINEN: What worries me if we don't do it, what happens?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Nothing.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There's no reason for approving a design for fear a worse one is coming. You cannot design anything this way. You know it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's a hell of a way to go about it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We can't approach it that way.

MR. SASAKI: Again I don't think that's my main point, but if I look at the aerial photograph here, the site plan, the site apparently is a difficult thing and this solution is a better one than the former one. It does relate, I think, rather well. First time I've seen this thing tied down. Since this is a mass and this is a mass (indicating)

MR. BUNSHAFT: Roche yesterday laid a very beautiful aquarium on that site.

Let's for the moment say this is the greatest man of our time, Roosevelt, who should be getting something equal or close to the quality of Lincoln, better than the Jefferson

thing, maybe not as great as Washington. Are we talking that this thing is in that league? I'm not.

MR. SASAKI: I don't think Jefferson is so hot.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No, I said it has to be better than Jefferson. We're in control of this, and if we were to let this go, I think myself we have failed our whole purpose, really, no matter how nice Breuer is.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It boils down, really, Hideo, to simply this: do you want to approve it? There isn't any other "out."

MR. SASAKI: Well, I'd have to think about that one a little bit because as I said, I came here with -- you know -- a conviction I would be a minority of one.

MRS SAARINEN: All of us did. All of us were against it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I really thought that everybody would be against it, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I was preparing my minority statement. No kidding.

MR. SASAKI: I guess the thing that appeals to me the most about the scheme is the notion of the site plan because I thought an alternate solution to the one that our office did or I did, you might say, which used this point (indicating on drawing) to build this thing up, and then have this, is the site of using this (indicating). I think

he has done this. I don't think this relationship (indicating) is so happy. I would have probably moved it away more, but I think the notion of using this cove is really quite good.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'm trying to sell you, and you are me -- I guess that's what I'm doing.

MRS. SAARINEN: I really would like to think, too.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Here you have a completely radical thing, the kind of design that you have to approach from all directions. This isn't an entrance at all; it's like taking a pinwheel and trying to get an entrance on it. I think when you say you like the site plan, you're being carried away with this other stuff which looks pretty but it's just, you know, paper drawings. But there are no entrances. In fact, this kind of thing ought to be out somewhere, where you come into it from all directions.

Here, when you go out of here (indicating on model), you have to go back -- you know what I mean? It really isn't a thing --

MRS. SAARINEN: I think also there's a question, as Gordon just said, when you go out and come in again. Now if you go out and you are walking around,-the other scheme you were walking around and reading things, as well as having an experience. I felt yesterday and I'm trying to talk myself back into feeling that this was not really much of an

experience, that you were walking like if your children in the nursery have blocks around, ~~like that~~ -- you were walking around, but you weren't having a new experience; you were not being led from one thing to another. The shapes themselves, you know -- on the other hand, I don't know -- as he talked and I kept looking at this air thing and everything, I began to waver then. I think it is true the more you look at it from over here (indicating on model), the worse it is, and it's sort of hard to get inside. Really when you are inside, what does lure you any place? You are lured over here, yes, (indicating) to a view of Washington over here, but what would make you want to wander in and out, is what I'm asking myself.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Look at that rendering over there. It's really sort of unpleasant, just sort of stands alone. I do think we must think of the highest level. We are not approving a school and trying to be nice or something. We are talking about the most important monument built in our times. When you get into that level, I would rather have none.

MR. SASAKI: I think maybe if I were voting for this whether to accept or reject it, I'd probably reject it. As I said this morning, Bill, the first thing is a sense of nothing very great or unusual. It is a symmetrical design with centrality in it. When you visualize these things, they

go all the way around. I think the older one had a sculptural feeling, so there was a variation and change. I think if he worked with that, he could do that variation. Maybe this is too trite a resolution of forms and spaces on that basis. So I think on that basis, you know, if I were to make a decision --

MRS. SAARINEN: Yesterday I called it "stage scenery."

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, we are talking about making a decision today and agreeing on what we are going to write and having it released tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, we don't have a deadline. We don't have to release it tomorrow.

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman, I think if I were to vote, I guess I would stick with my first impression which was a sense of disappointment. When I saw it I had a sense of disappointment because it was a little ordinary, a little trite. As a matter of fact, I expected him to do something more asymmetrical because the Whitney Museum in many ways is a personal statement, a sculptural thing.

MRS. SAARINEN: Well, I think he would argue for a memorial you want something timeless, and so forth. I keep shuddering when I think how the Fine Arts Commission sat around this table and Gilmore Clark said, "The arch will be built over my dead body."

MR. BUNSHAFT: But we're not Gilmore Clark.

MRS. SAARINEN: No, but of their time -- but I don't think this is an entrance -- this time I don't think we are against it because it's beyond the time.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Breuer is older than this Commission. Eero was a young man and Gilmore was an old man.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Aline, we think this is way out of date.

MRS. SAARINEN: I think so, too; that's why I said "stage scenery."

MR. ROSZAK: A point of information, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. ROSZAK: I think this design is practically impossible to do anything with, including a desire to modify it. I would hate to think that we are entertaining the idea or that Mr. Breuer is anticipating the possibility of doing something with this design.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. Fiddling.

MR. ROSZAK: Yes. So I think we should have a very solid position about this particular design. No fiddling. No modification. No trial and error business all over again.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, that draft that has been written is pretty clear. It just disapproves. It doesn't ask for anything --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, this is now outdated since we have had further discussion, but I'll read it and then we can rip it to pieces. It goes like this:

"After careful study and analysis, the Commission of Fine Arts has agreed unanimously that Breuer's proposal for a memorial to President Franklin Roosevelt is inadequate to both the importance of the site and the man being honored. We feel that the scope of such a memorial requires the highest standard of artistic achievement and monumental significance. On neither of these grounds does this design succeed."

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's the main statement.

MRS. SAARINEN: I would say that it needs a little editing.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is just a draft.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: This is just a draft. I'll read it all.

"It might conceivably be suitable on a site giving access from all directions but even that would not solve the major problems that are presented. Angular ground walls proposed are too reminiscent of a stage setting. Equally inappropriate is the incised pop art portrait

of the President combined with the sound track of his voice which are currently fashionable techniques but ones that cannot be associated with a dateless monument. The Commission has studied all aspects of the plan and reached its conclusions with great reluctance, aware of the many difficulties faced by the Roosevelt Memorial Commission."

MR. SASAKI: Sometimes it is better not to say too much because they can kick you back in the teeth. Can we leave out the "pop art" thing?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MRS. SAARINEN: Also leave out the fact it would be better on another site and all those things.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'm for making it short. The main thing is it should be monumental, the significance of the man, and this is not it. Shorter the better. I wouldn't even open with "inappropriate to the site." I would open with monumental, and then later on say --

MR. SASAKI: The first thing you read was most excellent.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You mean just two sentences?

MR. SASAKI: Yes, something of that sort; and then if we can add a little more without going into too much detail.

MRS. SAARINEN: Isn't it better to say this is submitted to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We can say the new proposal.

MR. BUNSHAFT: As a matter of fact, it was the unanimous vote of the Fine Arts Commission members who were present -- present-- who were present. I can hear Kelly screaming now.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: He will be allowed to make any statement that he wishes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You don't have to put in "present." All right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Who was present will be a matter of public record.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Okay. I just brought it up.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: He is perfectly welcome to make any statement.

He did send those letters saying he wanted to be recorded as approving. Well, we can record him but he can't participate in the vote.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Also, he shouldn't have done that because he hasn't seen this. He guessed wrong.

MR. SASAKI: He is a minority of one.

MRS. SAARINEN: Bill, read it sentence by sentence.

CHAIRMAN WALTON (Reading draft): "After careful study and analysis, the Commission of Fine Arts

has agreed unanimously that the new proposal for a memorial to President Roosevelt is inadequate to both --"

MRS. SAARINEN: Excuse me. "Has voted not to approve." Period. Then make a statement. In other words, the first sentence should be, "We vote unanimously to reject it" or "not approve it" or something, and then you give the reason, because the unanimous thing has to do with not approving.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: "After carefuly study and analysis the Commission of Fine Arts unanimously"--

MRS. SAARINEN: "Reluctantly."

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, no, no.

MRS. SAARINEN:Okay.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: ". . . has rejected unanimously the new proposal for a memorial to President Roosevelt." Period.

Then you want to go into this business: "We feel the scope of such a memorial requires the highest standard of artistic achievement and monumental significance. On neither of these grounds does this design succeed."

MRS. SAARINEN: "Grounds" is the wrong word. "Requires" this something or other.

MR. BUNSHAFT: "Criteria."

MRS. SAARINEN: It does not fulfilll -- it isn't that it does not succeed. It does not fulfill both these criteria.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you can leave out about the site completely.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I skipped the site.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I mean leave it out even later.

MRS. SAARINEN: Now could you re-read that?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: "We feel that the scope of such a memorial requires the highest standard of artistic achievement and monumental significance. This design does not fulfill either criteria.

MRS. SAARINEN: Now what does that mean, this word "scope"? The scope of this -- I don't understand that word there. Have straight English.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right. We'll leave that out.

"We feel that such a memorial --"

MRS. SAARINEN: That a memorial to President Roosevelt requires or whatever it is -- it's not the "scope" that requires.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I ~~say~~ said I left it out, if you'd just listen.

"We feel that such a memorial requires the highest --"

I'll read from the beginning:

"After careful study and analysis, the Commission of Fine Arts has rejected unanimously the new proposal for a memorial to President Franklin Roosevelt. We feel that such a memorial requires the highest standard of artistic achievement and monumental significance. This design does --

MRS. SAARINEN: "In our opinion."

CHAIRMAN WALTON: "does not fulfill either criteria."

MR. SASAKI: Can I ask a question here, Bill? I think"the highest standard of artistic achievement"is good because we're saying this is a little lesser quality. Then "and monumental significance." Now, they'll always pick these up as key words.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. SASAKI: So I think "monumental significance" is going to be a terribly important word. What do we mean by that, if someone asks? Could it be appropriateness?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Instead of "monumental" say "dignity."

MRS. SAARINEN: Or how about "artistic achievement" and "significance," leaving out the "monumental"?

MR. SASAKI: I think that's better.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I like "significance" better than "appropriateness."

MRS. SAARINEN: "Dignity," "importance," and "monumentality" in the real sense.

MR. SASAKI: That's good. Now, then, we can stand on that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Translated "We don't like it."

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What else do we want to say?

MRS. SAARINEN: I don't think we should say one thing more.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'm not quite sure that this is the position. We must advise Congress on why. We can't just be dictatorial and enigmatic.

MR. BUNSHAFT: There are details that we strongly object to, such as sound, technique of illustrating the thing; but these are not as important as the basic thing, you know -- something like that. Make those secondary things not to confuse them.

MRS. SAARINEN: Shouldn't we, before we get to secondary things, say more major things to back this up?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I like the phrase "trite forms."

MR. SASAKI: I just wonder if after coming out with such a statement, then the next thing is to pick this guy up because you knocked him down, and we could say that we certainly appreciated the designer -- wholly aware of the difficulty of the problem -- but we feel as though the form is not -- well, it's trite -- I wouldn't say "trite."

MRS. SAARINEN: No, I think your phrase was nice. You know -- we reach this decision with reluctance, aware of the seriousness of the designer and the difficulties of the challenge of the problem, something like that.

MR. SASAKI: I think that is very good. Let's start with that now, this new thing.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: "This design does not fulfill either criteria. The Commission has studied all aspects of the plan and reached its conclusions with great reluctance, aware of the many difficulties that have been faced by the Roosevelt Memorial Commission and the designer."

MRS. SAARINEN: No -- aware of the seriousness of the designer and the many problems faced by the Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think the way Bill has written it is the closing sentence, and I'd leave out the stuff about the sound and photography.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would like to have one or two sentences --

MR. SASAKI: Can we say just what you said, Bill? We objected to many things but they were more of a minor --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: He was saying it right, if I could have gotten it down. Try to say it again.

MR. SASAKI: That we objected to these things but they weren't really our major point.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There are small items we don't care for, such as sound and the method of showing Roosevelt's portrait, but these are really secondary to our basic concern.

MR. SASAKI: Yes, that's right. I think something of this sort.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's just more words. You could be kind and say that this design is a very pleasant, very carefully studied design if you want to be positive, but --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I don't think we can.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I was going to then say, "but it is not a solution for the level of this problem." The hell with that!

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, we can't do that.

MRS. SAARINEN: Now this thing about the secondary things, also I do think -- I agree, you don't need them but if Bill thinks you do, let's try it. But I think you can't do them without some other statement of the kind like Sasaki's which has to do with either the triteness of the forms or the deadness of the experience or the something -- and then you say that there were also other small considerations but these were secondary.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Bill, this press release, the thing you have written so far, without anything, is really what it ought to be for the seriousness of this event. I think the press is going to talk to you and you can answer them about

these secondary things, and you know you can do it talking, and I think we are going to belittle this statement trying to work in some of this stuff.

MRS. SAARINEN: I agree totally. If you want us off the record to give you some little notes --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, you have dozens of them but I don't think you ought to write them.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Let me read it to you then as it stands, if you keep the last paragraph.

> "After careful study and analysis, the Commission of Fine Arts has rejected unanimously the new proposal for a memorial to President Franklin Roosevelt. We feel that such a memorial requires the highest standard of artistic achievement and significance. This design does not fulfill either criteria.
>
> "The Commission has studied all aspects of the plan and reached its conclusions with great reluctance, aware of the many difficulties that have been faced by the Roosevelt Memorial Commission and the designer."

MRS. SAARINEN: I would make two amendments, if I could, as suggestions: one is you say "in our opinion the design has not fulfilled."

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, no.

MRS. SAARINEN: All right, then I think I'd put first "aware of the seriousness of the designer and the problems" -- or whatever it is -- "faced by the Roosevelt Commission," because what we're really considering is the architecture, not the problems,as the most important part.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Just reverse the order.

MRS. SAARINEN: Just reverse the order of those two things.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: "Faced by the designer and the Roosevelt Memorial Commission."

MRS. SAARINEN: The first question, if I were a reporter and I came to you, and you were in the very embarrassing position of being a minority on the previous thing, I'd say, "Mr. Walton, this is fascinating to me because here your Commission by approving the previous thing presumably felt it had the highest artistic achievement and significance. Wherein did the Commission feel this one has less artistic significance," and you're going to have to answer the press and you're on a spot.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Then I'd say, "Essentially they felt the forms were trite, that it did not create an experience that was significant enough to memorialize Franklin Roosevelt."

MRS. SAARINEN: Perfect.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The approach is not significant, the space is not signficant.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, ask me another question.

MR. BUNSHAFT: She could come back and say, "Was that achieved in the previous design"?

MRS. SAARINEN: Yes, and then you'd have to say that was the opinion of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The majority of the Commission felt it was achieved.

MRS. SAARINEN: I'd say, "Your Commission made the previous design reduce its size; don't you like the horizontalit of this better?" You'd say what?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'd say, "Yes, we did, but as one member pointed out, they looked somewhat like stage set flats that were put out there, and from a distance would just look as though they were stored; thatit was not finished."

MRS. SAARINEN: That they in themselves have no significance.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You could also say, "Yes, it is lower, we like the theory but the solution is not very happy."

MR. SASAKI: I think at that point Bill could admit there are many qualities we like, but it still doesn't add up to the total thing.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think myself when they get that release, they'll run to get it in the paper,so fast they won't

ask anything.

MRS. SAARINEN: I really think totally that this simple dignified statement is right; once you begin canned music and the photo thing, that's the thing someone catches onto and you get into discussion that is really incidental because frankly I'm not sure that reproducing the photograph isn't a good idea.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I agree with you.

There is apparently enormous feeling against this design. I've stayed out of this. Isn't that what you're reading?

MR. ATHERTON: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Dillon Ripley came over to me and said, "I hope you're not going to approve that." He also said that there's great feeling in Washington against it.

MRS. SAARINEN: If I had known Dillon Ripley was against it, I might have been for it.

Well, I am reluctant about turning it down, I'm sorry, and I wish it were much better.

MR. ROSZAK: One more pathetic aside: he said he chose granite for that structure because it's an eternal material.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I know. If he'd just let it dissolve -- if he'd build it from adobe, we'd let him.

We have to in some way deal with A.I.A. What are

27 January 1967

Dear Mr. Congressman:

On the assumption that you are the acting head of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, I am writing to inform you that the Commission of Fine Arts, at its January 26th meeting, unanimously rejected the new memorial proposal.

Today the Commission is issuing a release briefly outlining its position. Such a memorial requires the highest standard of artistic achievement and significance. In the Commission's view, the proposed design does not fulfill either criteria.

I want to assure you that the Commission has studied all aspects of the plan and reached its conclusion with the greatest reluctance, aware of the many difficulties that have been faced by the designer and the Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

Yours very truly,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Frank Thompson, Jr.
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit T

NEWS RELEASE...AFTER FIVE P.M. FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 1966

Commission of Fine Arts
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington, D.C. 20240
Telephone 343-5324

WASHINGTON: 27 January 1967

After careful study and analysis, the Commission of Fine Arts has rejected unanimously the new proposal for a memorial to President Franklin Roosevelt.

The Commission feels that such a memorial requires the highest standard of artistic achievement and significance. The proposed design does not fulfill either criteria.

The Commission has studied all aspects of the plan and reached its conclusion with great reluctance, aware of the many difficulties that have been faced by the designer and the Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

Exhibit K

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
26 January 1967

AM

9:30 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. SUBMISSIONS-INTERVIEWS

9:30 1. Smithsonian Institution

Calder Fountain, Museum of History and Technology

(Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution; Dr. David Scott, Director, National Collection of Fine Arts)

10:00 2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. National Zoological Park - Proposed Designs

(Representatives of GSA and Alan Jacobs, architect)

10:30 b. Labor Department Building - Revised Design

(Representatives of GSA and Brooks, Barr, Graeber & White and Pitts, Mebane, Phelps & White, architects)

c. F.B.I. Building - Revised Designs

(Representatives of GSA and C.F. Murphy Associates and Beiswenger, Hoch, Arnold & Associates, Architects)

11:00 3. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

Overlook Parking Garage, Tenth Street Mall - Proposed Design

(Mr. Thomas Appleby, Director, RLA; Mr. Dan Kiley, landscape architect)

11:15 4. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

a. Addition of Cafeteria & Training Facility to Park Operations Building - Proposed Design

b. Fort Circle Park - Master Plan

c. Fairfax Village Playground - Preliminary Plan

d. Kenilworth Gardens, Visitors Center - Preliminary Plans

e. Dupont Circle Study

11:30 5. District of Columbia Government

a. Department of Highways and Traffic

Three Sisters Bridge (Central Potomac River Crossing) - Proposed Design

(Representatives of D.C. Dept. of Highways and Traffic)

b. Department of Licenses and Inspections

(1) Watergate Development - Revised Designs

12:00 (2) AIA Headquarters Building - Proposed Design

12:30 6. Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission

Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial - Proposed Design

(Representatives of Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission and Marcel Breuer, architect)